DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 681

HE 001 607

TITLE	Discussion Memorandum Concerning the Choice of a New President. [Memorandum of the University Committee on Governance.]
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
PUB DATE	Apr 70
NOTE	18p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
DESCRIPTORS	Administration, *Administrator Responsibility, *Administrator Role, Governance, *Higher Education, Personnel Selection, *Presidents, *Selection, University Administration
IDENTIFIERS	*Harvard University

ABSTRACT

This memorandum on the presidency of Harvard University poses some basic questions and makes some tentative suggestions. It deals with three basic issues: (1) the functions and structure of the office of the president; (2) qualifications of the new president; and (3) the procedures for selecting a president. Concerning the first issue questions are raised about the obligations of the new president, delegation of responsibility, the desirability of a limited term of office, and of periodic performance reviews. Questions on the qualifications pertain to ways they can be most effectively defined, and the relative desirability of intellectual attainment, human qualities and administrative ability and experience. Primary concern regarding the issue of election procedures is for the consultation process. Suggestions are actively solicited. (AF)

ED040681

THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Discussion Memorandum Concerning The Choice of a New President

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
APRIL 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 001 607

On September 19, 1969, President Nathan M. Pusey, at the request of the Board of Overseers, established the University Committee on Governance to devise ways to improve the governing processes of the University. The Committee, whose membership was selected in a variety of ways by the several constituencies, consists of faculty and student representatives from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the eight graduate professional Schools as well as two Overseers, one of the Fellows of Harvard College, a trustee of Radcliffe College, and a representative of the Associated Harvard Alumni. The Committee's reports and recommendations, when in final form, will be submitted to the Governing Boards of the University.

At its first meeting in October the Committee agreed that prior to submitting recommendations to the Governing Boards, it would publish preliminary reports or memoranda to seek the advice and comments of the Harvard community and others who may be interested. This discussion memorandum identifies issues related to the procedures for selecting a new president, the structure and functions of the presidency and the qualifications of the new president. As the work of the Committee progresses, comparable reports with tentative recommendations on or discussions of other subjects will be released.

Please send your reactions to this memorandum (in particular, your suggestions about procedures for selecting a new president and the structure and functions of the presidency) to the office of the Committee on Governance, Wadsworth House, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 02138, or give them to any member of the Committee.

JOHN T. DUNLOP
Chairman

ED040681

FOREWORD

The announcement of the President's resignation as of June 1971 has made urgent the inquiry of the Committee on Governance into the nature of the presidency, the structure and functions of the office of the president, and the procedures for choosing a president. The issues related to this subject thus become the focus of the Committee's first report to the Harvard community. It is already clear that the approaches to deciding these issues will be different from those used earlier in Harvard's history. The purpose of this discussion memorandum is to pose questions and stimulate discussion; the memorandum does not represent a Committee position on any issue. We invite you to join us in examining some of the questions about the presidency raised by Harvard's recent past and its present and future needs and opportunities

This memorandum divides the issues concerning the presidency into three topics, which are summarized in the following introductory paragraphs:

- Issues related to the procedures for selecting a president.
- Issues relevant to the functions and structure of the office of the president.
- Issues related to the qualifications of the new president.

The Committee plans to make recommendations to the Governing Boards on the first two topics, and consequently is interested in receiving comments and suggestions on them. Of particular importance at this point in time are your views on the procedures that should be followed in selecting the president. The Committee hopes that the questions posed concerning the qualifications of the new president, as well as those concerning the functions and structure of his office, will be helpful in framing your response to the Fellows' recent request for advice from the Harvard community.

Procedures

In accordance with existing constitutional procedures, the final choice of a president will be made by the Corporation and ulti-

mately approved by the Overseers. Almost everything else, however, will be different from previous practice. The Fellows have already begun the process of inviting large numbers of alumni, faculty, officers of administration, students, and employees to make suggestions of persons to be considered. It is hoped that persons who respond will make their suggestions in the light of their concept of the nature of the presidency, their view of the most important problems and opportunities of Harvard, and their assessment of the qualifications of the persons suggested. After this initial solicitation of suggestions, there will be several stages of consultation and the Fellows expect the Committee on Governance to recommend procedures by which the most effective consultation can be carried out.

The consultation process has a number of purposes. Because questions related to the presidency are complex and not convincingly answerable by any one person, consultation among a wide variety of people should generate useful ideas and answers for those who are charged with choosing the president. Furthermore, the Fellows have no intention of choosing a president unacceptable to his constituencies; a sensible process of consultation with these constituencies should help the Fellows achieve this goal.

The Fellows have invited a large number of people to become involved in the first stage of the consultation process. At later stages participation is likely to include those who continue study of the issues and become sufficiently qualified to contribute significantly to the resolution of the issues and the selection of a new president from among the candidates suggested.

The principal issues concerning the consultation process that remain unsettled are:

1. Who should assist the Fellows in the conduct of the consultation?
2. Who should be consulted and how much or how often?
3. How might the foreseeable negative consequences of so wide a consultation be minimized?

Before the Committee make recommendations to the Governing Boards on these matters, it asks for community opinion, in short, on how to make a time-consuming, widespread consultation effective and rewarding.

The Presidency

The questions raised by the Committee about the presidency itself concern chiefly what the job of the president of Harvard for the next ten years should be, how its authority and responsibilities might be disposed, and how the president's performance should be evaluated. We believe that no one can make influential suggestions to the Fellows about who the next president should be without at least a tentative decision about what the most important problems facing the president will be and what his most important duties will be. The detailed questions and issues have been grouped under these headings:

1. The extent to which the president should be the chief executive officer and educational leader of the entire University (rather than of any of its parts).
2. The opportunity or obligation of the president of Harvard University to become the national leader of private higher education.
3. The weight which should be assigned to the responsibility of the president in relating Harvard to its various communities – neighborhoods, cities, state and nation.
4. The degree of delegation of executive responsibility from the Governing Boards to the presidency and from the presidency to the Deans, and the division and coordination of authority vested in administration and faculty.
5. The division of the top executive and educational responsibility among other individuals in the office of the president and the extent to which the office must be restructured and augmented.
6. The desirability and problems of a limited term of office.
7. The extent to which the performance of the president should be periodically reviewed.

The Committee on Governance plans to make recommendations on these seven subjects to the Governing Boards and invites comments from the readers of this memorandum.

Qualifications of the President

The crucial questions which have so far been identified as answerable only after some consideration of the requirements of the presidency are:

1. How can the personal qualifications of candidates be usefully stated?
2. What intellectual attainment, potential or skill should a candidate possess and how must it have been made manifest?
3. What human qualities are required or desired?
4. To what extent must a president of adequate character, intellect, humanity, and strength of personality have administrative ability and experience as well?

Because these four questions are not best answered by a committee, the Committee on Governance does not plan to make recommendations on the issues they raise. The Fellows, however, would welcome individual views.

The Committee hopes that discussion of the issues presented throughout this memorandum will help close rather than widen differences within the University. Discussion of these issues should make the members of the University more aware of its opportunities, purposes and capacity to change. It should *not* foster the development of factions supporting a particular candidate. The selection procedures finally decided upon will be aimed at clarifying alternative definitions and resolutions of issues and thereby assisting the development of agreement. The discussions should relate the qualifications of possible candidates to a reasoned and eventually concerted appraisal of the University's needs for leadership.

I.

Issues Relevant to the Functions and Structure of the Office of the President

1. The extent to which the president should be the chief executive officer and educational leader of the entire University.

Although legally the president is always president of the University, he may in practice be primarily president of Harvard College or by interest or dominant need be more interested in one part of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or set of professional schools than another. The degree to which the new president should assume leadership of University-wide educational programs and interfaculty activities, propose structural changes in

the University, assume direct responsibility for financial and administrative as well as educational affairs, enunciate goals for the University, and suggest curricular innovation or reform is subject to debate and choice. Some resolution of this issue will be implicit in the choice of the person; his subsequent actions will lead to greater resolution. The Committee believes that the range of responsibility and role of the new president of Harvard should be better understood and more clearly articulated than hitherto, and narrowed to suit the capability of a single man and to meet the most important needs of the University. An immediate question is what interim resolution of this issue should guide the choice of president.

2. The opportunity or obligation of the President of Harvard University to become the national leader of private higher education.

Many problems, educational and others, beset private education nationally; these problems may affect the definition of the role of Harvard's new president. For example, the financial crisis, with its corollary of increased government support, may require that the president of Harvard take the lead in pressing for redefinitions of the role of state and federal support to higher education. Should this be an important aspect of his assignment? It is possible to conclude that this requirement is so central as to suggest demonstrated qualifications in this area. It could also be argued that in time the occupant of this office would be looked to for such leadership in any case. He would qualify for it, in this view, by virtue of his successful occupancy of the office.

3. The weight which should be assigned to the responsibility of the president in relating Harvard to its various communities — neighborhoods, cities, state, and nation.

Harvard's presence in its communities is now seen as a problem requiring attention, not only to such current concerns as housing, but additional foreseeable problems of land use and the participation of students and faculty in the affairs of the community. The priority assigned to this role of the president or to a vice-president for external affairs is a matter of personal and institutional strategy and relates to the extent to which the University is considered properly engaged in relating its pursuit of knowledge to the social,

moral and political problems of our time. The answers to question 5 below are also pertinent here.

4. **The degree of delegation of executive responsibility from the Governing Boards to the presidency and from the presidency to the Deans, and the division and coordination of authority vested in administration and faculty.**

Should the Corporation be much concerned with the day-to-day affairs of the University or should an augmented central administration make decisions reported in less detail to a Corporation that would then be less concerned with routine and more with fundamental policy? Should the President and Council of Deans constitute a partially autonomous decision-making group dealing with questions which concern more than one Faculty or should some other group, such as a University senate, deal with such matters? To cite two extremes, to what extent should the president be a strong leader rather than a mediator? The alternatives available for decentralizing or centralizing faculty and administrative responsibility and for coordinating and controlling decentralized activities are many. Harvard's history as a circle of "tubs" resting on their own bottoms, relatively independent in educational, financial, and administrative affairs, is the crucial context for these questions.

5. **The division of the top executive and educational responsibility among other individuals in the office of the president and the extent to which the office must be restructured and augmented.**

The Committee believes that the burdens of the presidency are too great for any one man. It plans to make recommendations with respect to the organization of the office. To cite only one possibility under discussion, if a vice president for educational affairs, a provost, or coordinator of University-wide programs (on the one hand) and a vice president for external affairs (on the other) are required, what should be the relationship between each of them and a financial and administrative vice president? The extent to which a fully manned executive office with considerable planning capability and time for detailed supervision of University affairs is preferable to a sparsely manned office which must necessarily delegate more completely its functions to

the Schools is debatable. The Committee believes, however, that some strengthening of an undermanned administration is required in any case. If this conclusion is concurred in, the question becomes how and how much. It is assumed, however, that the search for a president is for one person only. His choice of associates will be guided by the need to supplement his own experience and qualifications, by his own preference for structure, and by his own evaluation of individuals.

6. Given the burdens of the position and its rapidly changing requirements, what term of office is appropriate?

A question never before publicly raised at Harvard is now pertinent. Should a president (and perhaps his immediate subordinates as well as deans of Schools (be appointed for a term of office rather than on the presumption that he and they will serve to retirement? If so, what is the minimum time to permit his leadership to be effective? What is a reasonable time to prevent discontinuity on the one hand and the obsolescence of his qualifications on the other? Should this term be related to his age, to the predictable succession of problems he will face, and to the rate of change foreseen? Will electing a president to a finite term of office diminish his influence or reduce the attractiveness of the position to strong candidates?

7. To what extent, if at all, should the performance of the president be reviewed?

If a president serves an indefinite term, or if he be eligible for reappointment after terms of five to seven years, should his performance be reviewed? If so, by whom – by a combination of Fellows, Overseers, faculty, and students, possibly augmented by faculty and presidents of other institutions? What measures would be applied to his performance? How can the passions surrounding a crisis occurring at the time of evaluation be tempered by longer views? If presidents and other key executives of the University should serve definite terms, with the possibility of no renewal, should they have tenure as professors in order to provide career alternatives and to reduce the risk of administrative office? If not, what other guarantees of future income are appropriate? The desirability of regular review of performance of administra-

tors and perhaps ultimately of faculty as well will turn on one's analysis of those aspects of University life that most need improvement in quality.

II.

Issues Related to the Qualifications of the New President

1. How can the personal qualifications of candidates be usefully stated without cataloguing all the principal human virtues?

It is possible to list the qualities appropriate to all presidents everywhere, but perhaps more useful to list those suggested by the priorities assigned to the roles a new president of Harvard must fill and the problems he will face in the years immediately ahead. The most important broad requirements of the job to be filled may be used to assign weight to the qualities desired. Thus if the need for educational innovation at Harvard College is thought to be paramount, the qualities sought would be other than if the principal function of the presidency was conceived of as securing increased financial support to the entire University. If individuals or groups discussing these issues were to identify the half-dozen principal problems predicted to be the lot of the next president, the consideration of personal qualifications might be made more practicable and specific.

If definition of the presidency is not precise enough to denote principal qualifications, then intuitive appraisals of experience, character, integrity or charisma might be advanced. It may be useful to characterize the requisite skills and qualities as intellectual, human, and administrative, without deciding in advance of the consideration of individual persons and predicted problems the ideal or acceptable combination.

It is assumed that respect for and dedication to Harvard as an institution is an unarguable requirement. But must all candidates be alumni of Harvard College or of one of the graduate schools? The age of the president-elect is related to many other considerations, including term of office.

2. What intellectual attainment, potential or skill should a candidate possess and how must it have been made manifest?

It seems unlikely that a person even of great human qualities and

administrative skill would be considered for the presidency unless in some way he was committed to, and experienced in, the life of the mind. But such commitment may be demonstrated in many ways. It has been argued that the president should have been a teacher or a scholar in his own right, that he should presently be a member of one of the Harvard faculties, and that his workload be so arranged that he could continue scholarship in office. Other members of the Committee have argued that men, perhaps but not necessarily formerly of Harvard who are now national leaders, in education or out, should be considered. That a leading professional or creative person might possess the requisite quality of mind cannot automatically be ruled out. The extent to which the new president is envisioned as necessarily dealing directly with intellectual and curricular issues from a reasoned and experienced philosophy of education will influence judgment on this question. An externally oriented president of preeminent administrative ability might have a provost of much greater experience and skill in working with scholars of all disciplines. Analytical ability and high intelligence may be more important than the nature of the precise experience to which they have been applied in the career under question. In any case he must be capable of eloquence and clarity in restating university purposes, standards and ideals.

3. What human qualities are required or desired?

Recent history at Harvard and predictions of turmoil in the next decade suggest detailed consideration of such universally valuable qualities as youth, health, humor and emotional maturity. But more than the need for resilience, calmness of temper, tenacity of purpose and many other prerequisites of leadership, it is possible to argue that concern for people, for student and faculty morale, for the relation of mind and feeling, for differences in the points of view of generations, and for the transition from adolescence to adulthood may be paramount. Again it is judgment about the requirements of the office and the needs of the University to regain unity, discipline and morale that should make apparent which human qualities are most necessary in the new president. How much the president must be visible in the community as the symbol of its common purposes, as the arbiter of conflict, as father

figure, and the like, is an interesting question suggesting modes of action as well as personality. It can probably be finally answered only by noting the personal attributes of the officers who are to be associated with the president.

4. To what extent must a president of adequate character and intellect, humanity and strength of personality have administrative ability and experience?

More than ever before it is clear that the chief executive officer of an institution as complex as Harvard must already have or develop in office the capacity for institutional leadership. In view of the imperfect combinations of intellect, humanity, and management ability available in any one person, the principal choice in all realism is how heavily to weight a group of skills not ordinarily valued highly in academic circles. These include the ability to define, communicate, and secure commitment to goals, to organize effort to attain them, to judge performance, to recruit and select subordinate administrators of affairs ranging from those purely financial to those entirely academic. Besides supervision either directly or through subordinate officers, a university president in this age must be sensitive to the politics implicit in the relationships of powerful groups and individuals and to the feelings of those least influential in determining policy in organizations. To give effect to this sensitivity, he may have to add to the personal attributes of a good listener and to an instinctive concern for the opinions of others, the ability to understand, originate integrations of varied points of view and persuade people to their acceptance. Some would give special value to such important if unexciting qualities as the ability to run meetings, i.e., to guide, direct, and stimulate but not dominate faculty discussions.

It is evident that he must be capable of the management of crises as well as of ordinary organized activities. This art requires diagnostic ability, identification of informal leaders of opinion, selective consultation and persuasion and a sense of timing as much as such personal qualities as patience and courage. For those who would advise the Governing Boards, the important options to consider may well be the trade-offs among intellectual, humane and administrative qualities which will be required and considered acceptable as individuals are seriously considered. As individuals are recommended, we hope that the combination of these three categories of characteristics upon which

recommendations rest will be described in terms of the individual and personal style that integrates the various qualities.

III.
Issues Related to the Procedures for Selecting a President

It has already been decided by the Corporation that the search for the new president will be directed by Francis Burr, who shortly will become Senior Fellow of the Harvard Corporation. The search for a president has begun with the distribution of letters inviting suggestions to (among others) faculty members, students, key alumni, and employees. This first step is in itself unique in the history of Harvard. No large-scale solicitation of views by personal letters has been previously attempted, to our knowledge, in the University, although several thousand letters were written last fall to certain faculty and key alumni asking for suggestions to replace the two retiring Fellows. Robert Shenton is in charge of the staff which will handle the correspondence and appointments and has agreed to devote three-quarters of his time to this purpose.

More importantly, an unprecedented series of consultations is planned with key individuals and groups. After individual responses have been examined, a number of prospective candidates will be discussed with appropriate groups. Surviving candidates might be discussed later with the same groups. The object of this consultation is not to open the final election, constitutionally the duty of the Governing Boards, to popular choice. Rather it is to ensure that strong candidates emerging from the study of responses to the original letter are evaluated from all the important points of view in the University. Consultation in several stages is intended also to permit consensus to develop about the combination of qualities appropriate to Harvard's present needs for leadership and the alternative concepts of the presidency responsive to these needs. It will serve to educate the community about the issues suggested in this memorandum. Finally it should produce a thoughtful choice which neither surprises nor upsets the University community and which makes sense even to those whose appraisal of the University's needs and consequent preferences for individuals is different from that finally adopted by the Governing Boards. The consultation process is intended to produce

a more imaginative, more acceptable, and more appropriate choice of president that would otherwise be possible.

The issues that remain unsettled concern principally the consultation process:

1. Who should assist the Fellows in the conduct of the consultation?

The first and simplest possibility is that the consultation will be conducted entirely by the Fellows. The issue becomes urgent as we note the number of Faculties, student bodies, and alumni groups (at least ten each) whose views will be important. In addition, many of the individual respondents to the original letter will qualify for consultation in proportion to the thoughtfulness, originality, and persuasiveness of their proposed definitions of the presidency and corresponding nominations. Whether the time required would make the task impossible depends in large part upon the ability of the University community to establish clearing house representative groups as outlined under 2 below. A variety of options is possible. A large formal evaluation committee representative of faculty, students, and alumni is possible, but is not thought necessary by the Committee. A less representative small search committee, as indicated in the experience of other universities, might formalize the process and reduce its scale. Possibly the Committee on Governance itself, though large, unevenly representative, and established for another purpose, might be assigned the role of interpreter of some of the product of consultation. The members of the governance committees of the various Schools might assist in the conduct of discussions or the reporting of opinion among their constituencies. In an additional or substitute possibility, the Fellows might turn to an unpublicized small group of influential faculty, students, and alumni, chosen not to represent constituencies but for their important valid differences in experience and point of view and for their objectivity and ability to integrate differences. Individuals in this group could be deputized by the Fellows to meet with groups of persons on first or later discussions and report to them the content and significance of group reactions and suggestions.

Other possibilities are solicited. The Board of Overseers itself has indicated that it wants to be closely consulted. It is possible that responsible manpower to conduct consultation may be available from its Executive Committee. It has been suggested at various points that the University professors should have a unique

perspective and responsibility which might make them important contributors to the process. It has also been proposed that House Masters might interest themselves in holding discussions with students and tutors and that Deans in the smaller Schools or their delegates might try to stimulate thought and discussion. Whoever is enlisted to help, if a standard is established that only those who have thoughtfully considered the issues and have refrained from stubborn commitment to support a particular candidate or candidates are eligible for the later rounds of consultation, the amount of work may well be reduced.

It should be noted that although the present president of the University will in due course suggest names for consideration, he will not take part in the consultation or decision processes.

2. Who should be consulted and how much or how often?

One approach would be to note the formal bodies already established in the organization of administration, faculty, student, and alumni groups – for example, the Council of Deans, the Faculty Council of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Coordinating Committee or Appointments Committee of the Business School faculty, the executive groups of the various student governments and of the alumni. These formal organizations have important assigned responsibilities and would doubtless respond usefully. But just as these bodies are not considered even by themselves fully adequate to deal with the ordinary problems of the University today, they may not be the ideal agencies to deal with this most important special problem – especially if substantial change from established ways of doing things is implied in the development of support behind unconventionally qualified candidates.

It has been suggested that individual members of the Harvard community interested in participating in the presidential consultation may wish to form groups of their own for discussion of the issues and of candidates and for reacting to the progressively smaller lists of possible names. Presumably they would form themselves and request from the office set up to assist the Fellows the opportunity to be consulted. As a second alternative, an interested individual, already a member of many groups (a House, club, department, standing committee, etc.) might turn to the groups he considers most interested and competent to put these issues on their agenda. Such groups might request participation in the consultations or choose to report the result of their

deliberations. Obviously those conducting the consultation might approach other individuals and groups as they demonstrate in one way or another their capability to contribute usefully to the process. The design of the crucial later rounds of consultations would depend on the success of the first round and the characteristics of the consensus or conflict developed during that process. The breadth of the consultation planned means that no known model is available from other University experience and that much innovation is possible.

3. How might the foreseeable negative consequences be minimized?

The dangers of the planned consultation are identified so far as follows:

1. The sheer volume of work may overwhelm those conducting the process.
2. The process may divide rather than unify the University by stimulating premature commitment to candidates, by offending groups whose advice is not accepted, and by doing injury to our present leadership.
3. Candidates surviving the scrutiny of groups with different points of view may be hackneyed famous names neither available nor desirable, or acceptable but ultimately mediocre people. Means need to be found to prevent the elimination of initially controversial individuals prior to objective consideration of their strengths.
4. A "credibility gap" may occur between the Corporation and certain groups over the extent to which advice is being sincerely sought, objectively evaluated, and imaginatively interpreted.
5. Potential candidates may be alienated by premature publicity, gossip about their candidacy, and vigorous opposition, even if ill-informed and limited.

A variety of means for dealing with these dangers can doubtless be devised; innovative suggestions will be especially welcomed. The Committee on Governance is optimistic that the tolerance, mutual respect, and good will of the main constituencies of the University are still massively effective, despite the disturbances of last year and this and the widespread impression that reform is required on several fronts. Awareness of the dangers should in itself diminish them. At the same time, unconventional sugges-

tions, particularly of individuals not now known to most of the University, should not be excluded by hostility to innovation, loyalty to stereotypes, or parochial traditionalism.

Imagination should produce some means of keeping alive the candidacy of strong individuals whose stands on single issues or behavior in special circumstances may have produced opposition in the past. Prejudice may be diminished by greater familiarity with such persons' true qualities. If the consultation process does not result in minds being changed on a number of issues and persons, it will not be sufficiently interesting or productive to be worth the effort and expense.

That consultation is not merely a formal routine can only be demonstrated by the way it is conducted and the responses it produces. Ideas for keeping the community informed about the reality of the Corporation's desire to have full and candid reactions both to the consultation process and to the possibilities it produces may well be forthcoming in the responses to this document.

New and ingenious ways of preserving confidence during a long and wide consultation process may be discovered, but the Committee is not optimistic. It has adopted the interim view that the "leaks" from the process may be so numerous and contradictory as to be merely noise not taken very seriously by anyone. It believes also that a potential president of Harvard who is sensitive to having his name bandied about by faculty and students will be too thin-skinned in any case to tolerate the abrasions of the responsibility.

It is possible that the pitfalls of an untried process testing the limits of practicality by its scope are more numerous than now foreseen. Notice of other dangers would be welcomed by the Committee.

Conclusions

The length and detail of this document suggest that the Committee's invitation to comment on procedures providing wide participation and discussion about the nature of the Harvard presidency and the qualifications of those who deserve to be considered for it should not be taken lightly. The Committee expects that many people interested in popular candidates or in superficial disposition of issues may wish to take part without preparing themselves to do so usefully. It hopes, however, that a consider-

able number of concerned persons and groups will demonstrate their interest and qualification to take part by responding to this document with thoughtful criticism, suggestions for amplification, or creative solutions to some of the problems attending the procedures here discussed.

The opportunities which lie ahead for a self-critical Harvard emerging from chronically scant attention to the need for effective administration and for educational reform appear to the Committee to be enormous. That persons of the quality required to lead Harvard to its new opportunities are available and willing to serve is certain. To identify them and to provide in the process the support that will enable the next president to begin his career with the acceptance of most of the University should indeed be possible. The next president's performance after his appointment will of course be more important than all the hopes that attend its beginning. But first he must be installed in such a way as to gain wide assent to his selection by the Governing Boards. The process should have the positive value of persuading him not only of initial support but of the opportunities visible now for achievement in service to Harvard and higher education equal to that of the greatest of his predecessors.

As indicated in the introduction to this document, we would like your comment on the consultation procedures proposed. We would also like you to participate in the consultation process by discussing the issues related to the presidency and to the qualifications of the new president. We hope that you will either lead or respond to leadership as appropriate in group discussions of your opinions and those of others. The first stage of general discussion will, we hope, begin the process of assigning weight to or redefining the issues raised here. It will qualify individuals, in a sense, for subsequent consultation and give influence to their developing judgment. If the University ultimately comes to a clearer picture of its needs for leadership and to greater unity of purpose and spirit as a consequence of the ambitious consideration of the presidency proposed here, the investment of energy will be more than vindicated. The wisdom in the choice of the next president by the Governing Boards will be informed and made visible by whatever success attends this invitation to you to take part in considering the issues before us.